UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

KEVIN ALMY,

Plaintiff,

ORDER

vs.

D. DAVIS, et al.,

Defendants.

)

2:12-cv-00129-HDM-VCF
)

ORDER

On January 29, 2015, plaintiff filed a motion contending that some of his legal documents that were transported with him to Reno for trial had not been returned to him (#475).

On February 13, 2015, defendants advised the court that they were investigating the matter (#483).

On February 20, 2015, plaintiff mailed a "motion to expedite" submission of his motion to enforce (#485). In the motion, plaintiff asserted that he was still missing his legal materials. Plaintiff also requested various types of relief, including monetary compensation for the withholding of his materials.

On March 2, 2015, defendants responded that plaintiff's legal property had been returned to Southern Desert Correctional Center, where plaintiff is currently housed, on February 20, 2015 (#487).

On March 6, 2015, plaintiff filed a document entitled "Amended Reply to Opposition to Expedited Request to Enforce/Modify Order/Instruction Doc. #386" (#489). In it, plaintiff reasserts

Case 2:12-cv-00129-HDM-VCF Document 492 Filed 03/26/15 Page 2 of 2

requests for a court order and sanctions against the defendants and others for the confiscation of his property.

On March 10, 2015, defendants filed a response to plaintiff's motion to expedite, in which defendants argued the motion should be denied as moot as all of plaintiff's legal property has been transported to SDCC for delivery to him (#490).

Defendants have represented to the court that plaintiff's legal materials have been returned to him, or at least have been transported to the correctional facility where he is housed such that they can be delivered to him. Plaintiff has not presented any evidence to the contrary, nor has he identified any specific documents to which he still lacks access. Accordingly, the plaintiff's motion to enforce court order (#475) and motion to expedite (#485) are **DENIED AS MOOT** insofar as both motions request the return of plaintiff's property. The motions are **DENIED** in all other respects as without merit and/or beyond the scope of this court's authority in this matter.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: This 26th day of March, 2015.

Howard & MEKiller

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE